

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-13, 15-23, and 25-30 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102) by Freeman (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,980). Applicant traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 recite a method, system, and signal bearing medium for processing a message in a network computing system including a facsimile transmission comprised of a recipient contact address and message content, wherein the message content includes at least one of message text and attached files. These claims require: managing with the facsimile server the facsimile transmissions as fax jobs; transferring with the facsimile server the message content to a conversion computer; maintaining, with the conversion computer, multiple application programs to convert the content of different attachment files to images in the file format, wherein a plurality of the application programs are capable of converting files in different formats to an image file format; launching, with the conversion computer, at least one application program to convert the message content to converted message in the image file format; transferring, with the conversion computer, the converted message content to the facsimile server; and transferring, with the facsimile server, the converted message content in the image file format to a communication port for transmittal to the recipient contact address.

Applicant amended claim 11 to correct the first computing system to a facsimile server.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 require that a facsimile server managing the transmission of fax jobs transfers the message content of a fax job to the conversion computer to convert the message content. The claims further require that the conversion computer transfers the converted message content back to the facsimile server, where the facsimile server then transfers the converted message content to a communication port for transmittal to the recipient contact address.

The Examiner cited the fax machine terminal 112 as the claimed facsimile server and the fax server 122 as the claimed conversion computer. (Office Action, pgs. 2-3) The Examiner further cited col. 8, line 7 to col. 9, line 59 and col. 10, lines 6-60 of Freeman as disclosing the claim requirement that the conversion computer, which received message content from the facsimile server, transmit the converted message content back to the facsimile server, where the facsimile server then transfers the converted message content to a communication port for transmission.

The cited cols. 8, 9 and 10 discuss how the terminal 112 (likened to the claimed facsimile server) routes a fax to the facsimile server 122 (likened to the claimed conversion computer) that translates and transmits the message content to an email server 132, where the subscriber or fax recipient can access their fax through the email server. The cited col. 9 also mentions how the fax server 122 may transmit an email with the fax attachment to the subscriber. (Col. 9, lines 20-60). Nowhere do the cited cols. 8, 9, and 10 anywhere disclose that the cited fax server 122 that converts the fax content send the content back to the terminal 112, which the examiner likens to the fax server. Instead, in the cited Freeman, the fax server 122 (likened to the conversion computer) sends the translated content by email to the user or to an email server 132 that the user may access.

Thus, the Examiner has not cited any part of Freeman that discloses the claim requirements that the conversion computer that receives fax message content from the facsimile server and converts the content, return the converted content to the facsimile server from whence the content came to transfer to a communication port to the recipient. Instead, the cited Freeman discusses how a terminal 112 that receives the fax and sends the fax to the fax server 122, which converts the message, sends the content directly by email to the user. Freeman does not disclose that the fax server 122 doing the conversion send the content back to terminal 112 (likened to the claimed facsimile server) to transfer to the recipient.

The Examiner further cited col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 55 as disclosing the claim requirements of maintaining, with the conversion computer, multiple application programs to convert the content of different attachment files to images in the file format, wherein a plurality of the application programs are capable of converting files in different formats to an image file format; launching, with the conversion computer, at least one application program to convert the message content to converted message in the image file format (Office Action, pg. 3) Applicant traverses.

The cited col. 7 discusses how the fax server 122 (likened to the claimed conversion computer) can translate a fax transmission into subscriber selected file formats, such as formats used by common application programs, e.g., Powerpoint, Lotus Freelance, etc. However, the claims require that the conversion computer maintain multiple application programs to convert content from different attachment files to an image file format. The cited col. 7 discusses the

reverse operation of going from the fax format to different object file formats. Nowhere does the cited cols. 6-7 anywhere disclose using different application programs to convert the message content in different file formats to images in an image file format.

Accordingly, claims 1, 11, and 21 are patentable over the cited Freeman because the cited Freeman does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12, 13, 15-23, 22, 23, 25-30 are patentable over the cited Freeman because they depend from one of claims 1, 11, and 21, which are patentable over the cited Freeman for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, certain of the dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 2, 12, and 22 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21 and further require transferring, with the facsimile server, a job number assigned to the fax job to the conversion computer and requesting, with the conversion computer, the message content for the job number, wherein the facsimile server transfers the message content in response to receiving the request from the conversion computer system. The Examiner cited col. 8, line 37 to col. 9, line 59 and col. 12, lines 7-67 as disclosing the requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicant traverses.

The cited cols. 8-9 discusses a record format including subscriber contact information maintained by the fax server 122, which the Examiner likens to the conversion computer. The cited fax server then creates an email message from the converted content and the subscriber contact information. The fax server 122 then sends the email message to the email server 122 or directly to the subscriber. The cited col. 12 discusses how facsimile device 112 receives a facsimile and routes the message to a fax server 120, which includes the cited fax server 122.

Although the cited cols. 8, 9, and 12 discuss how the terminal 112 receiving the fax routes the fax to a fax server 112 to convert, nowhere does the cited Freeman anywhere disclose or mention that the conversion computer, which the Examiner likens to fax server 122, request the message content for a job number from the facsimile server, which the Examiner likens to the cited terminal 112 of fax machine. Further, nowhere does the cited Freeman anywhere disclose that the terminal 112 (likened to the claimed facsimile server) transmit the message content to the fax server 122 (likened to the conversion computer) in response to a request from the fax server

122. Instead, with the cited Freeman, the terminal or fax machine 112 routes the content to the fax server 122 to convert and then email, no back and forth as claimed.

Accordingly, amended claims 2, 12, and 22 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Amended claims 3, 13, and 23 depend from claims 2, 12, and 22 and further require maintaining, with the first computing system, a job table including fax job records identified by job number and changing, with first computing system, state fields in the fax job records to manage the workflow of the fax jobs between the first computing system, second computing systems, and communication port.

Applicant amended claim 3 to correct the second computing system to the conversion computer.

The Examiner cited col. 8, lines 52-58 as disclosing the claim requirement that the facsimile server maintain a job table including fax job records. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicant traverses.

The cited col. 8 discusses subscriber contact information maintained by the fax server 122 (likened to the conversion computer) that converts the content. Nowhere does the cited col. 8 anywhere mention that the claimed facsimile server (which the Examiner likens to the terminal 112) maintain a job table including fax job records. Instead, the cited subscriber contact information is maintained by the fax server 122, which the Examiner likens to the claimed facsimile server, not the terminal 112 likened to the claimed facsimile server.

The Examiner cited col. 8, line 37 to col. 9, line 59 and col. 12, lines 7-67 of Freeman as disclosing the claim requirement that the facsimile server change state fields in the fax job records to manage the workflow of the fax jobs between the first computing system, second computing systems, and communication port. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicant traverses.

The cited cols. 8-9 discuss a record format including subscriber contact information maintained by the fax server 122, which the Examiner likens to the conversion computer. The cited fax server then creates an email message from the converted content and the subscriber contact information. The fax server 122 then sends the email message to the email server 122 or directly to the subscriber. The cited col. 12 discusses how terminal facsimile device 112 receives a facsimile and routes the message to a fax server 122.

Although the cited cols. 8, 9, and 12 discuss how the terminal 112 (which the Examiner likens to the claimed facsimile server) receives and routes the facsimile transmissions to the fax server 122 (likened to the claimed conversion computer), nowhere does the cited Freeman anywhere disclose that the terminal 112 (likened to the claimed facsimile server) anywhere change state fields in fax job records to manage the workflow of fax jobs between the facsimile server, conversion computer, and communication port. Instead, the cited cols. 8, 9, and 12 discuss how the terminal 112 routes the facsimile transmission to the fax server 122 to convert and transmit to the subscriber. Nowhere does Freeman disclose that the terminal 112 (likened to the claimed facsimile server) manage a workflow of fax jobs between the terminal 112 (likened to the claimed facsimile server), the fax server 122 (likened to the claimed conversion computer), and a communication port.

Accordingly, claims 3, 13, and 23 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 6, 16, and 26 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21 and further require that for each attachment file received from the facsimile server, the conversion computer further performs determining one of multiple application programs capable of opening the attachment file and using the determined application program to convert the content of the attachment file to one or more images in the file format, wherein all the images in the image file format comprising the at least one converted attachment file are transferred to the first computing system. The Examiner cited col. 8, line 37 to col. 9, line 59 and col. 12, lines 7-67 of Freeman as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Office action, pg. 4) Applicant traverses for the following reasons.

The cited col. 8 discusses how the fax server 122 converts the fax transmission to different object file formats, e.g., Powerpoint, Freelance, etc. However, nowhere does the cited Freeman anywhere disclose that the fax server 122 (likened to the conversion computer) use different application programs to convert content of an attachment file to images in an image file format. Instead, the cited Freeman performs the reverse operation and converts the fax transmission into different object file formats, not to an image file format as claimed. Thus, the cited Freeman uses the cited translation software to convert the fax transmission to different object file formats, not the same image file format as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 6, 16, and 26 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 8, 18, and 28 depend from claims 6, 16 and 26 and further require maintaining, with the conversion computer, multiple application programs open to concurrently convert the content of different attachment files to images in the file format. The Examiner cited col. 8, line 37 to col. 9, line 59 and col. 12, lines 7-67 of Freeman as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicant traverses for the following reasons.

The cited col. 8 discusses how the fax server 122 may convert fax objects to different object file formats. Nowhere does the cited Freeman anywhere disclose maintaining multiple application programs open to concurrently convert the content of different attachment files to images in a file format.

Accordingly, claims 8, 18, and 28 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 9, 19, and 29 depend from claims 8, 18, and 28 and further require that the different attachment files concurrently converted to images in the file format are part of different fax jobs. Because the cited Freeman nowhere discloses multiple applications to convert attachment files to an image file format, the cited Freeman likewise nowhere discloses the additional requirements of claims 9, 19, and 29 that the concurrently converted attachment files are part of different fax jobs.

Accordingly, claims 9, 19, and 29 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-30 are patentable over the art of record. Applicant submits that no additional fees are needed. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: March 3, 2004

By:

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Haynes & Mann, LP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984